

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

A B S T R A C T

P.S - Irrigation and CAD Department – Certain irregularities noticed in finalisation of tenders for executing the work of Peddagadda Reservoir Project near Kesali (v) in Pachipenta (M) of Vizianagaram District – Article of charges framed against Sri U.Narayana Raju Superintending Engineer (Retd) along with others - Appointment of Smt. Chandana Khan, IAS, Member, Commissionerate of Inquiries, General Administration Dept as Inquiring Authority – Enquiry report submitted – Further Action Dropped – Orders – Issued.

IRRIGATION & C.A.D. (SER.X.2) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Rt.No.899

Dated:16 -07-2008

Read the following:-

1. G.O.Rt.No.1237, I & CAD Deptt., dt:2-9-2006
2. G.O.Rt.No.1238, I & CAD Deptt., dt:2-9-2006
3. From Sri U. Narayana Raju, SE (Retd) representation dt:8.11.06
4. G.O.Rt.No.820, I & CAD (Ser.X.2) Deptt., dt:30-5-2008
5. From Smt. Chandana Khan, IAS, Member, COI (GAD) D.O.Lr.No. 696/COI-CK/2007, dt:30-5-08.

ORDER:-

In the reference first and second read above, the following articles of charge has been framed against Sri U.Narayana Raju, Superintending Engineer (Retd) along with others for the irregularities noticed in finalisation of tenders for executing the work of Peddagadda Reservoir Project near Kesali (v) in Pachipenta (M) of Vizianagaram District.

Article of Charge-I:

In the first tender call for the above work, after disqualifying Sri R.Subba Raju, the lowest tenderer, the Commissioner of Tenders has accepted the bid of L2 i.e, G.Venkata Reddy & Company instead of awarding the work to the L2 for Rs. 737.52 Lakhs, you have relied upon the memo. of Engineer-In-Chief (Administratin Wing) Dt. 28-2-04 and wasted the time available to you from 05-02-04 to 28-2-04. Unconscious of protecting Government interest you have resorted to second call, causing a loss of at least Rs. 88 lakhs to the Govt.,.

Article of charge-II:

In the second tender call for ECV of Rs.870.09 Lakhs when the bid was opened again Sri. R.Subba Raju emerged as L1 with (-) 24% less, which worked out to Rs. 661.26 lakhs. The COT accepted the recommendations of L1 at Rs. 661.26 lakhs. Instead of awarding the work to L1 you have once again relied on Govt., instructions dated 29-03-04, which stated to await Govt., instructions. Taking this pretext, you have not acted as per powers and rules in vogue and thus failed to protect Government interest.

Article of Charge-III:

In a calculated move you have avoided the least tenderer L1, with an aim to further the interest of L3 who has quoted 5.04% less. You have complicated the issue further by requesting for extension of tender validity to which as expected only L3 & L4 responded. Having gone to courts it is not beyond element of doubt how L1 & L2 could not extend the validity of their tenders.

Article of charge-IV:

Supposedly by making a misrepresentation to the Principal Secretary, I&CAD, you have reportedly obtained oral permission from the Principal Secretary, I&CAD, for making the third tender call. The third tender call was made for no justified reasons and the work was allotted to Deepika constructions, the L1 in 3<sup>rd</sup> tender call at (-) 5.11% less. On account of your mishandling and willfully misusing the communication gap, a loss has occurred to Govt., as the tenders, which could have been settled for Rs. 661. 26 lakhs, had to be eventually awarded for Rs. 825 Lakhs.

2. In the reference 3<sup>rd</sup> read above, Sri U.Narayana Raju, Suerintending Engineer (Retd) submitted his written statement of defence.

3. In the reference 4<sup>th</sup> read above, Smt. Chandana Khan, Member, Commissionerate of Inquiries, General Administration Department has been appointed as Inquiry Officer to conduct departmental inquiry into the above said irregularity.

//2//

4. In the reference 5<sup>th</sup> read above, the Inquiry Officer has conducted inquiry and submitted his report, in which it was reported that none of the charges framed against any of the charged officers is proved.

5. Government after careful examination of the entire matter have decided to accept the recommendations of enquiry officer and hereby drop further action against Sri U.Narayana Raju, Superintending Engineer (Retd).

6. The Engineer-in-Chief (AW), Irrigation & CAD Department, Hyderabad is therefore requested to take necessary further action in the matter.

( BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

S.P.TUCKER  
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

To

Sri U.Narayana Raju, Superintending Engineer (Retd) through Engineer-In-Chief (Administration Wing) , I & CAD Deptt, Errum Manzil, Hyderabad.

Copy to:-

The Engineer-in-Chief (AW), Irrigation & CAD Department, Hyderabad.

The, Accountant General, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

The Pay and Accounts Officer, Hyderabad.

The Andhra Pradesh Vigilance Commissioner, Hyderabad.

//FORWARDED : : BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER